

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,652	03/30/2004	Douglas W. Potter	M61.12-0610	5218
27366 7590 06/27/2007 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319			EXAMINER	
			MCFADDEN, SUSAN IRIS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_
	10/813,652	POTTER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan McFadden	2626	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period varieties or extended period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI , cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 M 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-41 are subject to restriction and/or expending the application.	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/are:  Applicant may not request that any objection to the  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ ob drawing(s) be held in abeya tion is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in A rity documents have beer u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No  received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application	

Application/Control Number: 10/813,652 Page 2

Art Unit: 2626

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - Claims 1-30, drawn to natural language processing using classes, classified in class 704, subclass 9.
  - II. Claims 31-41, drawn to an application programming interface and database structures, classified in class 707, subclass 100.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions: an application programming interface is not necessary for natural language processing.
- 3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

- 5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 6. A telephone call was made to Joseph Kelly on June 15, 2007 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 2626

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan McFadden whose telephone number is 571-272-7621. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Susan McFadden Primary Examiner Art Unit 2626

June 21, 2007